CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science
Minutes of Meeting 88-2
of the
Engineering and Computer Science Faculty Council
held
Friday, 18 March 1988

Present: Professors M.N.S. Swamy (Chairman); V.S. Alagar, B.B. Bhattacharyya, A.E. Blach, B.B. Budkowska, T.D. Bui, M. Douglass, T. Fancott, P.P. Fazio, D. Feldman, P. Grogono, J.F. Hayes, H.F. Li, Y.J. Lu, H.J. McQueen, O. Moselhi,M.O.M. Osman, R.V. Patel, E.I. Plotkin, F. Sadri, O. Schwelb, T. Stathopoulos, G.D. Xistris; Student representatives S. Khoury, P. Stiles (ECA), M. Auger, V.S. Dantu (ECSGA); P.M. Bourassa (Secretary);

Absent with apology: Professors F.D. Hamblin, A.J. Saber, S. Sarraf; Mr. B. Smart (Registrar's Rep.); Mrs. Z. Jirkovsky (Library); Mr. I. Youssef (ECA).

Visitors: Mr. D. Dobrofsky (Liaison); Prof. A. Ramamurthy.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Motion
88-2-1

It was proposed that the agenda be adopted, with the addition of one item as No7: the approval of a slot course in Civil Engineering. This proposition was carried unanimously.

2. Adoption of Minutes of Previous Meeting

Motion
88-2-2

It was pointed out that, in the second paragraph on page 2, the name of Ms. Perry was misspelled. Also, the 1,000 applicants referred to towards the end of the same paragraph were those who had applied to the Civil Engineering Department rather than the whole Faculty.

Subject to these two corrections, the Minutes of Meeting 88-1 were adopted unanimously.

3. Chairman's Remarks

Dr. Swamy referred to a letter from the Vice-Rector, Academic on the subject of Academic Planning for 1989-1991. He said that the planning process is to be initiated at the department level and that the objectives will be brought to the attention of faculty members at the department meetings.

4. <u>Representation of Part-Time Faculty Members on Senate</u>

The draft resolution prepared by the Senate Steering Committee was submitted for discussion. It was felt that, if Council were to support the draft resolution without clarifying some of its implications, particularly how a part-time faculty member would be elected and for how long, and what should be his/her compensation for committee work, it could be said that it approved the representation of part-time faculty members without really meaning it. Also, there does not appear to be a definition as to exactly who is included in the term "Part-time faculty member". Some comments were made to the effect that the role of part-time faculty members in this Faculty is quite different from what it is in other Faculties, where their involvement approaches that of full-time faculty members. In Engineering and Computer Science, much of the part-time teaching is done by graduate students, who are already represented, and people teaching non-technical courses (engineering economics, engineering law, technical writing), who have a voice through the Complementary Studies Committee. The rest are either adjunct professors, or lecturers who are hired for single-term courses and therefore could not be valid members of Senate for a one-year period.

Some Council members said that we would not want to prevent other Faculties from enacting whatever they wish concerning the representation of part-time faculty members on Senate. However, in this Faculty, we should perhaps start at the Department level. Finally, the following motion was submitted.

Motion
88-2-3

WHEREAS a substantial number of the part-time teaching in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science is done by graduate students who are already represented on Senate;

WHEREAS the revised wording proposed below does not specifically exclude part-time faculty, and is thus flexible enough to accommodate their inclusion when and if this becomes practical and desirable,

This COUNCIL RECOMMENDS that the draft resolution on the Representation of Part-Time Faculty Members on Senate be amended so that paragraph (i) would read:

"Three (3) faculty members from the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science;"

and SUPPORTS the rest of the document, subject to the concurrence of the Faculties concerned by paragraphs (h), (j) and (k).

The question was called and the resolution was adopted by a vote of 20 in favour, 1 against and 3 abstentions.

5. **Representation on the Senate Sub-Committee on Academic Computer Policy**

The following resolution was moved by Dr. Hayes and seconded by Dr. Douglass:

Motion 88-2-4

Whereas there are two representatives from the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science to the Senate Subcommittee on Computer Policy, one of which is chosen from and elected by members of the Department of Computer Science, it is resolved that the other representative should be chosen from and elected by members of the engineering departments in the faculty, i.e. Building Studies, Civil, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering.

Dr. Bui said that he is not against the resolution although he feels that it is not necessary and does not change anything. However, for the record, he said that the Senate document defining the composition of the Sub-Committee did not mention two representatives from this Faculty but, rather:

> One representative from each Faculty;
> One representative from the Department of Computer Science.

During the discussion, some members said that they would much prefer to see this question resolved by a mutual understanding rather than a formal vote on a resolution.

Finally, through the discussion, a new resolution emerged and the mover and seconder agreed to withdraw Motion 88-2-4 and to submit the following:

Motion 88-2-5

WHEREAS the Department of Computer Science has a representative on the Senate Sub-Committee on Academic Computer Policy,

COUNCIL ADVISES the Dean that the representative of the Faculty on this Sub-Committee should be from one of the engineering departments, namely the Centre for Building Studies, the Departments of Civil, Electrical & Computer or Mechanical Engineering, and elected by all full-time faculty members in the Faculty.

The question was called and Motion 88-2-5 was adopted by a vote of 20 in favour, 2 against and 4 abstentions.

There was then a proposition to the effect that the representative from the Department of Computer Science be elected by all full-time faculty members in the Faculty.

This led to some discussion and various counter-proposals were made. Finally, a consensus was formed around the following proposal:

Motion
88-2-6

BE IT RESOLVED that the representative of the Department of Computer Science to the Senate Sub-Committee on Academic Computer Policy be elected by the full-time faculty members of that Department, the election being subject to ratification by the Engineering and Computer Science Faculty Council.

This motion was adopted unanimously.

6. Change in Course Description

A revised course description was proposed for ENGR 666 - Solar Energy Materials Science. This is given in Doc. ECFC 88-2-3 and is the result of further discussion between departments.

Motion
88-2-7

The revised description for ENGR 666 appearing in Doc. ECFC 88-2-3 was adopted unanimously.

7. Slot Course Proposal

Motion
88-2-8

Council gave unanimous approval to a proposal by the Civil Engineering Department for a slot course on the Dynamics of Soils as described in Doc. ECFC 88-2-4 which was distributed at the meeting.

8. Motion to Adjourn

Motion
88-2-9

Council unanimously approved a motion to adjourn.